## Case 3:14-cr-00210-TEH Document 5 Filed 04/28/14 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 14 - 210 - 1 EH-1
Plaintiff, ) v. )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT $FILED$
ong Van Meap  Defendant.	APR 282014
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on speedy Trial Act from 4/28, 2014 to 5/	, 2014, the Court excludes the C
Failure to grant a continuance would be See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	e likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the pro- or law, that it is unreasonable to expect	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of secution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	eny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	nreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	nreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time ing into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: Y/28 14	JOSEPHC. SPERO United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney